

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-15, 24-26 are now pending in the application. By this amendment, Claims 1, 3, and 4 have been amended, Claims 2 and 16-23 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, and Claims 24-26 are added. The basis for these amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained therein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 08313890 (Hidenori et al).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 calls for a substrate for a liquid crystal device having a planar region and a roughened region comprising microscopic peaks and valleys. See Specification at pg. 19, Ins. 11-25. In addition, independent Claim 1 calls for “a predetermined mark made of a metal film” being formed on the planar region, and “a reflecting film made of the same metal film” formed on the roughened region. See Specification at pg. 21, Ins. 6-21, and FIG. 1F.

In this manner, a liquid crystal device is provided incorporating a substrate having

a roughened region and a planar region. See Specification at pg. 19, Ins. 11-13. In addition, a metal film is disposed on display areas of the liquid crystal device (planar and roughened regions). See Specification at pg. 21, Ins. 6-9. The metal layer acts as a reflecting film on the roughened region and is patterned on the planar region to form an alignment mark. See Specification at pg. 21, Ins. 9-11, pg. 21, Ins. 15-17, and FIGS. 1E-1F.

Hidenori fails to teach such a relationship. Rather, Hidenori teaches a liquid crystal display element having a roughened region and a planar region. See Hidenori at FIG. 9. In this manner, Hidenori fails to a predetermined mark formed on the planar region. In fact, the office action notes that Hidenori fails to teach a predetermined mark formed in the planar region. See Office Action mailed January 16, 2004 at pgs. 3-4. Therefore, Hidenori fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because Hidenori fails to teach a predetermined mark formed in a planar region, Applicants respectfully submit that Hidenori fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hidenori as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of JP 10-062604 (Hideo) and U.S. Patent No. 6,315,801 (Miyazaki et al).

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hidenori as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,973,763 (Fujimura et al).

Claims 7-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hidenori as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,130,736 (Sasaki et al).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants note at the outset that the Hideo fails to teach a predetermined mark made of a metal film being formed in the planar region, and “a reflecting film made of the same metal film” formed in the roughened region, as recited in Applicants’ independent Claim 1. Rather, Hideo teaches forming a photoresist over a glass substrate to form a plurality of lens areas on the glass substrate. See Abstract of Hideo and FIGS. 1a-1c. Hideo may suggest using a portion of the photoresist layer as an alignment mark. See Abstract of Hideo and FIGS. 1a-1c. However, Hideo fails to teach using a metal film for use as an alignment mark. Furthermore, Hideo fails to teach a metal film formed over both the roughened area and the planar area, which is then patterned in the planar area to form an alignment mark. The photoresist of Hideo cannot satisfy the requirement for the metal layer of the claimed invention. Moreover, the photoresist of Hideo is completely removed from the roughened region to form a lens region. In contrast, the metal layer of the claimed invention remains on the roughened region to form a reflective layer.

Independent Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 2 is cancelled. Claims 3-15 depend from independent Claim 1. Dependant Claims 3-15

should be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to Claim 1. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 24-26 have been added. The basis for these new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 16, 2004

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/MHS